

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LENORA ROBINSON,)	No. C 11-1339 LHK (PR)
)	
Petitioner,)	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
)	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
)	
v.)	
)	
WARDEN W. MILLER,)	(Docket No. 21)
)	
Respondent.)	

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a second amended petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner has requested appointment of counsel. However, the Sixth Amendment’s right to counsel does not apply in habeas corpus actions. *Knaubert v. Goldsmith*, 791 F.2d 722, 728 (9th Cir. 1986). While 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes a district court to appoint counsel to represent a habeas petitioner if “the court determines that the interests of justice so require,” the courts have made appointment of counsel the exception rather than the rule. Appointment is mandatory only when the circumstances of a particular case indicate that appointed counsel is necessary to prevent due process violations. *See Chaney v. Lewis*, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986).

Petitioner has thus far been able to adequately present her claims for relief. Respondent

1 has been ordered to produce the state records. No evidentiary hearing appears necessary in this
2 case, nor are any other extraordinary circumstances apparent. At this time, appointment of
3 counsel is not mandated, and the interests of justice do not require appointment of counsel.
4 Accordingly, the motion is DENIED. This denial is without prejudice to the Court's *sua sponte*
5 reconsideration should the developments of this case dictate otherwise.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: 10/6/11


LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge